UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/522,201	03/09/2000	Rabindranath Dutta	AUS990858US1	4117

24033 7590 04/20/2005		EXAMINER	
KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP		NGUYEN, MAIKHANH	
315 S. BEVERLY DRIVE			
# 210		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212		2176	

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09/19/20</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-27</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-27</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>05/28/2004</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Appeal Brief filed 09/19/2004 to the

original application filed 03/09/2000.

2.   Claims 1-27 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, and 19 are

independent claims.

3.   In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 09/19/2004, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY

REOPENED. A new ground of rejection s set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following

two options:

(a)   file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under

37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(b)   request reinstatement of the appeal.

4.   If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a

supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or

. 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Duperrouzel et al.** (U.S. 6,832,355 – filed 07/1998).

As to independent claim 1:

a.   Duperrouzel teaches *(see the Abstract)* a method for displaying pages *(e.g., displays web pages)* in a viewer program *(e.g., a browser software program)* on a computer display monitor *(e.g., a display system)*, wherein the viewer program displays an application window *(e.g., display areas)*, comprising:

(i)   downloading a first and second pages *(e.g., receives web pages)* from one of multiple servers *(e.g., from web sites)* over a network *(e.g., via the network) (col.2, lines 1-17 and col.4, lines 20-28)*;

(ii)   automatically concurrently displaying *(e.g., multiple web pages to be simultaneously displayed; col.4, lines 44-57)* the first page in a first window pane *(display pane 212a; col.5, lines 1-7 and Fig.2)* and the second page in a second window pane *(e.g., display pane 212b; col.5, lines 1-7 and Fig.2)* in the application window according to predefined settings specifying how pages are to be displayed in the first and second panes *(e.g., provides controls for a particular web page being displayed within the display pane 212; col.5, lines 1-7)*;

(iii)   downloading a third page from one of multiple servers over the network *(e.g., receives web pages via the network from web page sites; col.2, lines*

*1-17/ web pages that have been download from multiple web page sites;
col.4, lines 44-57)*; and

(iv)   downloading a fourth page from one of multiple servers over the network

*(e.g., receives web pages via the network from web page sites; col.2, lines
1-17/ web pages that have been download from multiple web page sites;
col.4, lines 44-57)*.

b.   Duperrouzel does teach automatically concurrently displaying the third and fourth

pages according to the predefined settings *(e.g., four non-overlapping web pages
are simultaneously displayed; col.4, lines 58-67)*. Duperrouzel, however, does not

specifically teach "displaying the third page in one of the first and second panes

and displaying the third and fourth pages in the first and second panes."

c.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to have applied Duperrouzel's teachings to include

*"displaying the third page in one of the first and second panes and displaying the
third and fourth pages in the first and second panes"* because it would have

helped the user to keep a general perspective in mind while examining more detail

in additional one or more displayed web pages, and it would also have allowed

the user to speed up searches.

d.   The fact that Duperrouzel's teachings *"A two web page display 610 has only two
display panes 212a and 212b"* (col.9, lines 7-14 and Fig.6) and *"has only two
display panes"* in Duperrouzel suggests that when the third and fourth web page

are downloaded, they will be simultaneously displayed in the first and second

panes.

As to dependent claim 2:

Duperrouzel teaches the first pane is displayed adjacent and to the left of the second pane

(Fig.5), wherein automatically concurrently displaying the third page and one of the first

and second pages comprises concurrently displaying the second page in the first pane and

the third page in the second pane *(col.9, lines 7-14 and Fig.6)*.

As to dependent claims 3:

Duperrouzel teaches caching previously downloaded pages in the order in which they

were downloaded from the network *(col.9, lines 21-53)*; and automatically concurrently

displaying the previously displayed page in the first pane and the first page in the second

pane *(col.9, lines 7-14 and Fig.6)* according to the predefined settings *(col.2, lines 3-17*

and col.5, lines 1-7) in response to the user input command to display the previously

displayed page *(col.11, lines 25-37)*.

As to dependent claim 4:

Duperrouzel teaches the first pane is displayed adjacent and to the left of the second pane

(Fig.5)

As to dependent claim 5:

Refer to discussion of claim 3 above for rejection.

As to dependent claim 6:

Duperrouzel teaches receiving user selection of a hypertext link within one of the

displayed pages; accessing the page addressed by the hypertext link *(col.6, lines 19-22)*;

automatically concurrently displaying the page currently displayed in the second pane in

the first pane and displaying the page addressed by the hypertext link in the second pane

if the user selected the hypertext link from the second pane; and automatically

concurrently displaying the page currently displayed in the first pane in the first pane and

displaying the page addressed by the hypertext link in the second pane if the user selected

the hypertext link from the first pane *(col.3, lines 30-44; col. 11, lines 9-37)*.

As to dependent claim 7:

Duperrouzel teaches the first pane is displayed adjacent and to the left of the second pane

(Fig.6).

As to dependent claim 8:

Duperrouzel teaches receiving user selection of a hypertext link within one of the

displayed pages in one of the panes; accessing the page addressed by the hypertext link;

and automatically concurrently displaying the page addressed by the hypertext link in the

pane opposite the pane displaying the page from which the hypertext link was selected

the page from which the link was selected in its current pane *(col.3, lines 31-44 & col.6,*

lines 5-22).

As to dependent claim 9:

Duperrouzel teaches the viewer program is capable of displaying the downloaded pages

in the first and second panes according to the predefined settings *(col.5, lines 1-7 & col.7,*

lines 13-25 and Fig.5), where the pages downloaded from over the network do not

include any page commands to cause the display of pages in separate panes within the

application window *(col.7, lines 15-25)*.

<u>As to independent claim 10</u>:

It is directed to a system for implementing the method of claim 1, and is similarly

rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 11-18:

They include the same limitations as in claims 2-9, are similarly rejected under the same

rationale.

<u>As to independent claim 19</u>:

It is directed to an article of manufacture for implementing the method of claim 1, and is

similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 20-27:

They include the same limitations as in claims 2-9, are similarly rejected under the same

rationale.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments filed 09/19/2004 have been fully considered but are moot in view

of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Cohn	U.S. Patent No. 5,712,995	issued: Jan. 27, 1998
Adams et al.	U.S. Patent No. 5,734,380	issued: Mar. 31, 1998
Santos-Gomez	U.S. Patent No. 5,712,995	issued: Jun. 23, 1998
Santos-Gomez	U.S. Patent No. 5,920,315	issued: Jul. 6, 1999
Brooks	U.S. Patent No. 6,008,809	issued: Dec. 28, 1999
Uchida	U.S. Patent No. 6,289,361	issued: Sep. 11, 2001
Holtzblatt et al.	U.S. Patent No. 6,683,633	issued: Jan. 27, 2004

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maikhanh Nguyen
April 14, 2005

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER